

**PATENT COOPERATION TREATY**

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

**PCT**

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

		Date of mailing (day/month/year)
Applicant's or agent's file reference <b>799-S05P0307</b>		<b>FOR FURTHER ACTION</b> See paragraph 2 below
International application No. <b>PCT/JP2005/000063</b>	International filing date (day/month/year) <b>06.01.2005</b>	Priority date (day/month/year) <b>06.01.2004</b>
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC		
Applicant <b>SONY CORPORATION</b>		

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the opinion
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP	Authorized officer
Facsimile No.	Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/000063

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.  
 This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language \_\_\_\_\_, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
  - a. type of material  
 a sequence listing  
 table(s) related to the sequence listing
  - b. format of material  
 in written format  
 in computer readable form
  - c. time of filing/furnishing  
 contained in the international application as filed.  
 filed together with the international application in computer readable form.  
 furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3.  In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.  
PCT/JP2005/000063

Box No. IV      Lack of unity of invention

1.  In response to the invitation (Form PCT/ISA/206) to pay additional fees the applicant has:
  - paid additional fees
  - paid additional fees under protest
  - not paid additional fees
2.  This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose not to invite the applicant to pay additional fees.
3. This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rules 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is:
  - complied with
  - not complied with for the following reasons:

The inventions of claims 1-34, 43, 44, 46, and 47 relate to tracking an object.  
The inventions of claims 35-42 and 45 relate to correcting blurriness.
4. Consequently, this opinion has been established in respect of the following parts of the international application:
  - all parts
  - the parts relating to claims Nos. \_\_\_\_\_

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.  
PCT/JP2005/000063

Box No. V **Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	3, 6-42, 44, 45	YES
	Claims	1, 2, 4, 5, 43, 46, 47	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	7-42, 44, 45	YES
	Claims	1-6, 43, 46, 47	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-47	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Document 1: Masaaki NAKAGAWA, Handycam o mochiite satsuei sareta gazoretsu kara no EPI no hosei ni motozuku shitsunai kankyo 3-jigen saikochiku, Denshi Joho Tsushin Gakkai Ronbunshi, Vol. J84-D-II, No. 2, 01 February 2001 pp. 266-275

Document 2: JP 2001-043382 A (Fujitsu Ltd.), 16 February 2001, paragraphs 0050-0071, Fig. 6

Document 3: JP 11-120364 A (Nippon Telegraph & Telephone Co. Ltd.), 30 April 1999, full text, all drawings

The inventions of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 43, 46, and 47 do not appear to possess novelty or to involve an inventive step over document 1 cited in the ISR.

The inventions of claims 3 and 6 do not appear to involve an inventive step over documents 1-3 cited in the ISR.

Document 1 describes a device for continuing feature point tracing by resetting feature points again in a frame in which tracing was interrupted.

It would be easy for a person skilled in the art to use the constitution for judging that estimation is possible in a case in which certainty of estimation of a position is larger than a reference value as described in document 2 to the device in document 1.

It would be easy for a person skilled in the art to use the constitution for estimating a plurality of corresponding points as described in document 3 to the device in document 1.

The inventions of claims 7-42, 44, and 45 are neither described in any of the documents cited in the ISR, nor are they obvious to a person skilled in the art.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.  
PCT/JP2005/000063

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

1. The description in claim 4 is unclear. Specifically, it is unclear how to "estimate the position of the second point," since it is "a case in which the estimation of the second point is impossible" in claim 4.
2. The description of claim 14 is unclear. Specifically, the constitution of the invention is unclear, as there is no description of a constitution "for selecting a second point based on the estimated point" in claim 14.

**PATENT COOPERATION TREATY**

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

**PCT**

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

		Date of mailing (day/month/year)
Applicant's or agent's file reference <b>799-S05P0307</b>		<b>FOR FURTHER ACTION</b> See paragraph 2 below
International application No. <b>PCT/JP2005/000063</b>	International filing date (day/month/year) <b>06.01.2005</b>	Priority date (day/month/year) <b>06.01.2004</b>
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC		
Applicant <b>SONY CORPORATION</b>		

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the opinion
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP	Authorized officer
Facsimile No.	Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.  
PCT/JP2005/000063

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.  
 This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language \_\_\_\_\_, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
  - a. type of material  
 a sequence listing  
 table(s) related to the sequence listing
  - b. format of material  
 in written format  
 in computer readable form
  - c. time of filing/furnishing  
 contained in the international application as filed.  
 filed together with the international application in computer readable form.  
 furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3.  In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/000063

Box No. IV      Lack of unity of invention

1.  In response to the invitation (Form PCT/ISA/206) to pay additional fees the applicant has:
  - paid additional fees
  - paid additional fees under protest
  - not paid additional fees
2.  This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose not to invite the applicant to pay additional fees.
3. This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rules 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is:
  - complied with
  - not complied with for the following reasons:

The inventions of claims 1-34, 43, 44, 46, and 47 relate to tracking an object.  
The inventions of claims 35-42 and 45 relate to correcting blurriness.
4. Consequently, this opinion has been established in respect of the following parts of the international application:
  - all parts
  - the parts relating to claims Nos. \_\_\_\_\_

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.  
PCT/JP2005/000063

Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement																						
<p>1. Statement</p> <table> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Novelty (N)</td> <td>Claims</td> <td>3, 6-42, 44, 45</td> <td>YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Claims</td> <td>1, 2, 4, 5, 43, 46, 47</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Inventive step (IS)</td> <td>Claims</td> <td>7-42, 44, 45</td> <td>YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Claims</td> <td>1-6, 43, 46, 47</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Industrial applicability (IA)</td> <td>Claims</td> <td>1-47</td> <td>YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Claims</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> </table>			Novelty (N)	Claims	3, 6-42, 44, 45	YES	Claims	1, 2, 4, 5, 43, 46, 47	NO	Inventive step (IS)	Claims	7-42, 44, 45	YES	Claims	1-6, 43, 46, 47	NO	Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-47	YES	Claims		NO
Novelty (N)	Claims	3, 6-42, 44, 45		YES																			
	Claims	1, 2, 4, 5, 43, 46, 47	NO																				
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	7-42, 44, 45	YES																				
	Claims	1-6, 43, 46, 47	NO																				
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-47	YES																				
	Claims		NO																				

2. Citations and explanations:

Document 1: Masaaki NAKAGAWA, Handycam o mochiite satsuei sareta gazoretsu kara no EPI no hosei ni motozuku shitsunai kankyo 3-jigen saikochiku, Denshi Joho Tsushin Gakkai Ronbunshi, Vol. J84-D-II, No. 2, 01 February 2001 pp. 266-275

Document 2: JP 2001-043382 A (Fujitsu Ltd.), 16 February 2001, paragraphs 0050-0071, Fig. 6

Document 3: JP 11-120364 A (Nippon Telegraph & Telephone Co. Ltd.), 30 April 1999, full text, all drawings

The inventions of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 43, 46, and 47 do not appear to possess novelty or to involve an inventive step over document 1 cited in the ISR.

The inventions of claims 3 and 6 do not appear to involve an inventive step over documents 1-3 cited in the ISR.

Document 1 describes a device for continuing feature point tracing by resetting feature points again in a frame in which tracing was interrupted.

It would be easy for a person skilled in the art to use the constitution for judging that estimation is possible in a case in which certainty of estimation of a position is larger than a reference value as described in document 2 to the device in document 1.

It would be easy for a person skilled in the art to use the constitution for estimating a plurality of corresponding points as described in document 3 to the device in document 1.

The inventions of claims 7-42, 44, and 45 are neither described in any of the documents cited in the ISR, nor are they obvious to a person skilled in the art.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/000063

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

1. The description in claim 4 is unclear. Specifically, it is unclear how to "estimate the position of the second point," since it is "a case in which the estimation of the second point is impossible" in claim 4.
2. The description of claim 14 is unclear. Specifically, the constitution of the invention is unclear, as there is no description of a constitution "for selecting a second point based on the estimated point" in claim 14.